

Chapter 6

Researching an authorial collaboration: Reflections on writing a journal article

**Catherine H. Arden, Mark A. Tyler &
Patrick Alan Danaher**

A crucial dimension of an effective research collaboration is the capacity to co-author publications arising from the research. Yet collaborative writing is as challenging as collaborative research, entailing complex processes of dialogue and shared meaning-making. This chapter explores the authors' ongoing writing collaboration, and the positive outcomes arising from it, as encapsulating one viable approach to creating and sustaining a productive research team. This argument is elaborated by means of separate and shared reflections on the composition of the group's first journal article (Arden, Danaher, & Tyler, 2005). These reflections yield important findings about the values and concepts underpinning the collaboration as well as specific strategies for writing and publishing consistent with those values and concepts. In particular, the authors' interpersonal relations constitute a resilient framework for sharing prior knowledge and for articulating areas of convergence and divergence in their respective conceptual, methodological and empirical priorities.

Introduction

Collaborative academic writing is as complex as it is common. Certainly a plethora of tools has emerged to address the needs of multi-author research and writing teams (Erkens, Jaspers, Prangma, & Kanselaar, 2005; Hainsworth, 2006; Laterza, Carmichael, & Procter, 2007; Weng & Gennari, 2004), and that emergence has been accompanied by interest in the explicit strategies that such teams enact to achieve their writing objectives (Noël & Robert, 2004; Weng, McDonald, Sparks, McCoy, & Gennari, 2007). Associated scholarship has focused on the sociocultural and linguistic elements of collaborative writing, including its taxonomy and nomenclature (Lowry, Curtis, & Lowry, 2004), its

connection with distributed cognition (Cronin, 2004) and its pedagogical possibilities (Storch, 2005).

Specifically in relation to collaborative writing and research teams, the current literature encompasses a range of issues relevant to this chapter. One concern is using writing to negotiate identity conflict and team socialisation (Lingard, Schryer, Spafford, & Campbell, 2007), including when team members are from different disciplines (Forman & Markus, 2005). Another strand is the induction and identity formation of new academics via collaborative writing projects (Tynan & Garbett, 2007), while another is the use of metaphors to interrogate the ways that academic authors collaborate (Kochan & Mullen, 2001; Ritchie & Rigano, 2007). Yet another issue is the evidently gendered dimension of a peer approach to mentoring and writing (Driscoll, Parkes, Tilley-Lubbs, Brill, & Pitts Bannister, 2009).

The chapter explores the authors' ongoing academic writing collaboration by considering our first published co-authored journal article (Arden, Danaher, & Tyler, 2005). Presenting first each author's separate reflexive account of the processes entailed in writing the article, as well as the positive outcomes arising from it, we then provide a joint synthesis of the values and concepts that emerge from the three reflections as well as of the practical strategies that we have used to implement those values and concepts. The chapter concludes by considering the implications of resilient interpersonal relations for sustaining synergies through our authorial collaboration.

Catherine's reflection: Learning through collaborative writing

The writing of "Struggling for Purchase: What Shape Does a Vocational Education and Training Agenda Take within a Contemporary University Education Faculty?" (Arden et al., 2005) was my first encounter with the process of collaborative research and writing in my new role as an academic in a regional university education faculty. As I re-read the article and reflect on the process of writing with my two colleagues, a number of factors emerge which, from my perspective, have been critical to the success of our early collaboration in terms of establishing and sustaining synergy as a writing team. It is these factors that I will attempt to elucidate here.

The collaboration that is the focus of this chapter began at a time when my colleague and I, as two recently appointed academics and commencing doctoral students, were struggling with the marginalisation of the further education and training (FET) department within our faculty that was fuelled by declining student numbers and pressures to fall into line with the dominant culture and discourse of school-based preservice teacher education in an institutional climate of scarcity and rationalisation. It is in this context that "Struggling for Purchase" was born, as my colleague and I, recognising a need for leadership, approached a newly-appointed associate professor (Patrick) with a background in non-traditional, adult and informal education for guidance and support. It just

so happened that Patrick was the co-editor of a new education e-journal. Thus began a writing collaboration that has been sustained for more than five years.

We decided to use the opportunity of a collaborative writing project as a vehicle to problem-solve our abovementioned dilemma, initially by bringing our respective theoretical perspectives to bear on the question of how we might position our vocational education and training (VET) agenda within the Faculty of Education (Arden et al., 2005, p. 32). My colleague and I already had had some lively discussions about VET issues, and we now would be challenged to theorise and reflect critically on our perspectives through a structured writing process. Each of us nominated a conceptual lens that resonated with our personal and professional ideologies that we used to interrogate our shared “practice problem” (Usher, 1987, p. 31) through an individual piece of reflective writing. This was followed by an engagement in dialogue (or *trialogue* in this case), where the authors “put their personal and professional ideologies under the microscope in a dialectic” that would in turn lead to the “development of a shared set of meanings” (Arden et al., 2005, p. 32) and the emergence of new insights that could inform and explicate possible ways forward. As my own epistemological perspective had been informed by a career as a vocational and community educator with a specific focus on supporting education and training opportunities for so-called disadvantaged learners, as well as a particular bent for experiential learning methodologies, I found myself drawn to the humanist tradition and chose the work of John Dewey (1916, 1938) as my conceptual lens. The rest, as they say, is history.

Five years hence, as I reflect on my experience of this writing collaboration, it is clear to me that, in writing this first article, important foundations were laid that have served me well in my academic career. If I were to nominate particular characteristics of this first collaboration that have stood the test of time and contributed to creating and sustaining collaborative writing synergies, they would be related to the primacy of respectful collegial relationships, the importance of enabling academic leadership, the enactment of the values of respect, integrity and trust, and finally the (serendipitous) writing configuration of three co-authors or the *trialogue*, which is presented in more detail in the following section of this chapter. Strategically as well as conceptually, nominating particular theoretical and conceptual lenses through which a relevant, shared practice problem can be viewed is helpful in a number of ways for the beginning academic and author. Initially, it encourages engagement with theory and theoretical perspectives that resonate with the novice author’s own personal and professional ideologies, and in doing so provides a point of engagement with theory made accessible through this resonance. Moreover, applying the chosen theoretical lens to examine the shared practice problem encourages the author to reflect on her praxis – the intersection between theory and practice – and how the theory informs and underpins committed action in the roles of educator and education researcher (see Parker & Arden, 2006).

Also important is the establishment of a framework within which the collaborative inquiry and writing process can develop. This is facilitated by a loose structure and format for the article that provides focus and direction, enables coherent, individual contributions as well as opportunities for synthesis of the ideas and the development of shared meanings, and is flexible enough to accommodate change as ideas develop and consolidate.

Most importantly for me, the collaborative writing process was, and continues to be, a richly educative experience, providing opportunities for learning on many levels (e.g., the technicalities, etiquette and ethics of collaborative writing). The learning has also been reflexive (Edwards, Ranson, & Strain, 2002; Usher, 1987) and transformative (Mezirow, 1991), with personal and professional ideologies challenged, assumptions questioned, philosophical standpoints repositioned and thinking refined in the light of new perspectives. One example of this reflexive learning is the tempering of my humanistic and pragmatic perspectives with the spirit of criticality articulated by Mark (Tyler, 2006) as *critical spirit*. This was a valuable contribution to the refinement of my pluralist epistemological perspective reflected in a description of myself as an emergent researcher who deploys “head, heart, hands and critical spirit” (Arden, 2006; Parker & Arden, 2006) in her work as educator and education researcher. Ensuring that this epistemological challenge occurred in a spirit of collaborative, critical inquiry, and establishing and fostering a safe environment by enacting the aforementioned values, have provided fertile ground for individual development and a strong foundation for a productive writing collaboration. That I have been able to take these capabilities and apply them to a number of successful writing collaborations with community-based colleagues in the field is evidence of the ripple effect that can result through collaborative writing as praxis, where learning is both theorised and connected to real-life situations.

Mark’s reflection: Struggling and collaborating

The first word of the title of our first journal article (Arden et al., 2005) *struggling* resonates with a period of my professional career where I was struggling. I was in a new job – a new academic within a faculty of education and undertaking a leadership role as the coordinator of four higher education FET programs focused on producing professional educators and teachers.

I was also struggling with identity, struggling for a Doctor of Philosophy topic and struggling to understand the culture of the academy. I remember feeling unsure and a little phoney at being considered appropriate to co-write with an associate professor. Catherine was just only slightly greener than I, so I thought, “At least we will be comrades in arms.” This added to my fortitude.

What was interesting was that Patrick invited us to write with him, a magnanimous gesture in itself, but to ask two unknowns to contribute to an academic paper? I remember feeling a combination of anxiety and elation to the

point of speechlessness. After Catherine and I consulted each other, we decided to take the offer with open arms.

During our preliminary meetings we established rapport quickly. Although still virtually unknown to one another, we began to work together effortlessly. On reflection, I believe that each of us was cognisant of the usefulness of basic respect. We knew how to listen and were open-minded enough to consider what was said by any of us as being a useful contribution. This, I believe, was our shared “commitment to theoretical multiplicity and plurality” (Arden et al., 2005, p. 34). This did not mean that we were similar; our diversity of perspective was well reflected in the paper. It meant that we valued one another’s stories enough to ensure that the particular variation on our voices was reflected in what we wrote. Another magnanimous gesture by Patrick was related to the fact that in our initial drafts of the article our word limit was exceeded. Patrick put his beloved Bakhtinian perspective (Bakhtin, 1981) on ice and continued to contribute through his provisionally poststructuralist lens. This was my first lesson as a novice academic – be open-minded to possibilities, always have something up your sleeve and take a gracious tone as respect for others gets you places!

Little did I know at the time, but I was beginning to put intellectual energies into surveying the topography of my Doctor of Philosophy. Critical theory and criticality played restlessly on the periphery of my focus, eventually taking me onto understandings of critical spirit (Oxman-Michelli, 1992; Siegel, 1988) and subsequently onto the usefulness this had for teachers in the vocational education and training (VET) arena (Tyler, 2008, 2009a). It was through the seeds of possibility derived from my ruminations over Freire (1970, 1973) and Habermas (1972, 1974) that I began my consideration and conceptualisation of what could have utilitarian value for Technical and Further Education (TAFE) teachers in questioning their status quo.

The other lens constructed in the article was that of the humanist tradition in education. Catherine penned this section. Some might suggest that the tensions between critical theory and the potentially functionalist perspective of humanism produced a gulf too great to breach. Nevertheless we deployed optimism and utilised the convergences to seek answers to our collective questions:

- What are the purposes of education?
- What are some useful pedagogies and learnings in enacting those purposes . . . ?
- How does the reflective and reflexive practitioner contribute . . . ?
- What do these purposes, pedagogies, learnings and reflective and reflexive practices mean for envisioning and enacting . . . ? (Arden et al., 2005, p. 39)

Interestingly, the critical and functionalist perspectives appeared to provide useful answers that satisfied our respective positions and pedagogies. For

myself, I began to utilise these convergences to develop a bridge that spanned the aforementioned gap between the functionalist and conflict traditions. This perspective, close to radical functionalism (Boshier, 2009), opened for me an engagement with the social structures that build false consciousness – in particular, the commodification of education through the infiltration of corporate models into the very context of my Doctor of Philosophy study, the VET sector. I started to develop an affinity with the position that the VET curriculum (and higher education for that matter) should cultivate citizenship “conceptualised as aligning with . . . personal transformation, collaborative relationships and social responsibility” (Tyler, 2009b, p. 204), as opposed to one that fostered a discourse espousing education for economic outcomes, a neoliberalist position that appeared to shape lifelong learning into an economically deterministic tool (Bagnall, 2000). Interestingly, my Doctor of Philosophy dissertation revealed that this was also a position held by some TAFE teachers.

Catherine’s section also gave me an opportunity to think further about the other foundational constructs I had established during a period of study and work in the human services industry. These further moulded the lenses through which I interpreted the world. I began to understand that I had synthesised the positions of Habermas and Freire with previously held perspectives of social role valorisation (Wolfensberger, 1972) and self-determination (Hughes & Agran, 1998). My realisation was that I had used my criticality as “the foundation to act with self-determined purpose and confidence” (Tyler, 2006, p. 54) within my past position as TAFE teacher. This, I believe, was crucial to shaping the methodology I deployed in my subsequent research.

The above are examples of the consequences of engaging in collaborative approaches to academic writing. For me, this engagement produced a growing trust of, friendship with and respect for the conceptual positions held by Catherine and Patrick. It also generated an acceptance that these positions were the means I used to leverage my understandings towards greater insights, particularly at a time when the uncertainty of Doctor of Philosophy study sent me into what Brookfield (1994) called “road running” (p. 211), the to-ing and fro-ing of progression in relation to moving forward with the challenge. Yes, this collaborative experience was truly a serendipitous happening, but one that I embraced wholeheartedly; and for me it produced a myriad of opportunities.

Patrick’s reflection: Collaborating through writing

Serendipity also played a part in my contribution to this collaborative writing project – at least in retrospect. My clear recollection is of meeting Mark at a social function (of the kind that I dread) hosted by a local professional association soon after my arrival in my new position at the university where Catherine, Mark and I currently work. I remember being intrigued by Mark’s work history and personal journey, and of establishing an immediate rapport

that has grown into friendship in the intervening five years. I suspect that Mark introduced me to Catherine, given their overlapping roles at the University of Southern Queensland. In any case, I quickly developed the same trust and friendship with Catherine that I enjoy with Mark.

These personal relations formed the backdrop to our deciding to write our first journal article (Arden et al., 2005) together, prompted by the opportunity presented by our faculty's organising an international conference whose refereed proceedings were to be published in the academic journal that was also being launched by the faculty and of which I was and remain a co-editor. The introduction to the chapter, at least implicitly, has indicated that collaborative writing entails potential risks and disadvantages. Yet, as our respective reflections demonstrate, for each of us the prospect of collaborating promised benefits that none of us could resist.

Certainly from my perspective the opportunity was too good to miss. Newly arrived from another university where I had worked for 14 years, I was keen to contribute to the same kinds of collaborative research and publishing relationships that had sustained me in my previous institution. Several conceptual resources can be called on to explain this desire; one that continues to appeal to me is Bakhtin's (1986) notions of outsideness and creative understanding – the proposition that interacting deeply with others can help us to learn about them, ourselves and the world in ways that are not possible if we learn alone. This proposition is clearly predicated on goodwill; while my research and writing collaborations have not always exhibited the requisite degree of this phenomenon, I had experienced it often enough and with a sufficiently diverse number of collaborators that I strongly desired to experience it again with Catherine and Mark.

Another recollection is that finding a topic about which we could all write and that in doing so we would contribute to attaining our separate as well as our shared interests was a relatively quick process. This was animated partly by the conference theme – *Meanings Under the Microscope* – and more particularly by the discipline area in which Catherine and Mark were working at the University of Southern Queensland (adult education and VET). One of my roles at my previous university had been as shadow program coordinator in the same discipline area, and a close colleague from there and I have continued to collaborate in publishing about that area. This meant that, although I certainly lacked Catherine's and Mark's expertise and experiential knowledge in the area, there was a basis for some focused dialogue from diverse perspectives.

My memory is also that the decision to write a conceptual rather than an empirical paper was made quite easily. Apart from not being confident of collecting and analysing data in sufficient time for the conference's timeline, we were all convinced of the value of good theory in helping us to make explicit and hold up for examination our underlying assumptions and values about education and research. Moreover, each of us had done extensive

theoretical reading in one or more of our past lives, so that we all had an opportunity to contribute equally to conceptualising and writing the paper. Furthermore, focusing on the faculty's VET teacher education programs provided us with a framework for delimiting our reading and writing and facilitating a theoretical dialogue about an empirical issue.

Turning now to the paper that we wrote (Arden et al., 2005), I notice simultaneously a number of features that I have not thought about since the paper was published. I see the hopefully logical and transparent structure, which was intended to assist readability and which also provided a clear basis for dividing the labour of writing, with different sections being assigned to each of us. I see the explicit effort to link theoretical ideas with empirical phenomena. I see the attempt to position the paper in broader fields of literature and to explicate its intended contribution to enlarging those fields. I see the two theoretical lenses – critical theory and criticality, and the humanist tradition in education – contributed respectively by Mark and Catherine, each of them extending my understandings of education theoreticians whose work I had read about at second hand, rather than in the original.

At the same time, as I reflect more carefully, the paper's title "Struggling for Purchase" – supplied by Mark, who delights in generating evocative metaphors in his writing – prompts me to ponder the degree to which an equivalent struggle took place during the writing process behind the scenes. While a new authorial team might be presumed to need to grapple with the notion of turning individual voices into a collective tone, our paper's structure provided a vehicle for achieving that outcome with reasonable ease. We minimised team conflict (Lingard et al., 2007) by respecting each person's authority and expertise about her or his chosen theoretical lens. And I was comfortable about relinquishing my "beloved Bakhtinian perspective" from this particular paper because I knew that I would have many opportunities to include that lens in future publications.

Writing the paper (Arden et al., 2005) was not much of a risk; if it had not worked out beneficially, we would have gone our separate ways without resentment. As it is, we have continued writing together regularly, including this chapter, and each time the conversations and planning are enjoyable occasions that consolidate our friendship while extending our collaboration as researchers and authors. Those conversations involve a lot of laughter, generally clustered around a meal; they also entail focused discussion of conceptual frameworks and empirical applications. They are transformative, in the way that all positive and generative relationships help to transform our understandings of one another and the world.

Synthesising the reflections: Values, concepts and strategies in collaborative writing

It is clear that our inaugural collaborative writing experience provided a launching pad for subsequent productive collaborative research and writing work for us as well as a vehicle for our ongoing personal and professional development as academics, writers, researchers and *collaborateurs*, and as such can be framed as a rich and authentic learning experience. Further, structuring the writing process as a triologue among three authors – each bringing her or his own theoretical lens to bear on the practice problem in a process of collaborative, critical inquiry – provides the scaffolding for engagement in dialogue that can result in the development of shared meaning, new insights and what Mezirow (1991) referred to as “perspective transformation” (p. 219) through the writing process.

The authors’ concept of the triologue as a mechanism for collaborative writing and learning can be explained with reference to De Weerd’s (1999) analysis of two “dialectically related constituents of dialogue” – that is, “direction and space” (p. 64). Drawing on Bakhtin (1984), Wertsch (1991), Shotter (1993) and others, De Weerd (1999) speaks of dialogue as a way of interacting in organisations where people “offset their need for ‘direction’ [which] stands for convergence, uni(formi)ty and certainty ... with ‘space’, [which] stands for divergence, multiplicity and possibility”, allowing for what he calls “the generativity of dissensus” (pp. 65-67). It is our view that the triologue – representing the notion of three co-authors as three voices engaging in the writing process as a dialogue – serves to open up this space more easily and potentially more effectively than the dyad (in the way that the triangle opens up the space among its three vertices). It is through the creation of this dialogic space that dyadic tendencies either to move towards premature agreement on “what’s real” (that is, the need for uniformity, consensus and certainty in order to preserve the relationship) or to adhere to a “fixed perspective” from which the communication can be “unilaterally controlled” (De Weerd, 1999, p. 66) can be avoided. Through the presence of the third person (who is each participant alternately engaging in a dyadic dialogue, acting as a witness to and/or facilitating dialogue between the other two participants), the triologue can actually serve to create what Shotter (1993, as cited in De Weerd, 1999) calls the “community of difference” in which “*belonging* does not imply *agreeing*” and “individual contributions are valued as part of the whole” (p. 68, *emphasis* in original).

The notion of the triologue as scaffolding for collaborative learning within a learning community also resonates with Palmer’s (1998) description of the community that provides the social structure for the “give-and-take” that he maintains we all need in order to hear our “inner teacher” (p. 152). A commitment to, and the enactment of, shared values (such as those identified in

different ways by each of the authors of this chapter – respect, integrity, trust, authenticity and diversity or heteroglossia [Bakhtin, 1984]) – can be seen as the ground rules for dialogue within the triad of this learning community of three academics. These ground rules for dialogue can, in turn, be brought to bear to mitigate against the conventional norms of politeness, rescuing and fixing as well as the “professional norm of competition” inherent in academic culture which, in combination, “create an ethos in which it feels dangerous to speak or to listen” (Palmer, 1998, p. 155).

The importance of enabling academic leadership has also been identified as a feature of this collaboration. Again according to Palmer (1998), “community is a dynamic state of affairs that demands leadership at every turn” (p. 161) – a kind of leadership that enables rather than dictates; that also teaches, but in a way that opens up space for growth and development through mutual exchange and support. The term *enabling academic leadership* is an attempt to describe a conception of leadership that is not about specific traits or characteristics of individual leaders, but that instead focuses on particular ways of working in an academic context that can be adopted by those in positions of power and influence. These ways of working can also be taken up by those whom Palmer describes as having “influence without position” in order to enable the writing collaboration as “conversation” to occur by “expect[ing] and invit[ing] it into being” rather than trying to coerce it (p. 161).

In summary, it is suggested here that the self-organising structure that is the triad of three co-writers with diverse perspectives and degrees of academic writing experience and expertise, enacting a shared set of values and the concept of enabling leadership, represents an ideal configuration for a dynamic, synergistic and sustainable writing collaboration and appropriately represents the authors’ shared perspectives on the nature of their work together.

Given this situation, it should come as no surprise that at the time of writing our continued collaborative writing efforts have resulted (sometimes in conjunction with other academics) in three proposals for edited research books, three refereed journal articles, seven book chapters completed and in preparation, two refereed conference proceedings papers, five conference presentations, one research symposium, and many conceptual and collegial discussions about collaboration within the faculty that we share. For us, one particular collaborative research effort (with another colleague with whom one of us had not previously published) expresses succinctly and concisely the key values and collaborative strategies that have evolved among us (Tyler & De George-Walker, this volume). This collaborative exercise was the construction of a collective concept map (Novak & Gowin, 1984). This map articulated the various shared conceptual positions held by the editors and authors of this book, the details of which are outlined in Chapter 5. We were three members of this group of seven, and our voices were heard from numerous quarters. Several concepts within the resultant concept map rang with the force of a clarion call:

heteroglossia or the co-existence of different voices (Bakhtin, 1981); authenticity or engagement without façade (Palmer, 1998); trust (its establishment and extension); reciprocity; and relationship. These were concepts that we introduced to the concept map and they remain as central, foundational components within our triologue that have proved to be a values-infused and strategically effective approach to sustaining the synergies of our collaborative writing.

Furthermore, this approach is crucial to engaging with the potential hypothetical response to this account, “But it can’t possibly be as easy as that!” We certainly do not see the development of our writing collaboration and the enactment of our triologue as easy or automatic; on the contrary, we have encountered and explored stimuli to our previous assumptions and thinking that have sometimes been challenging, even if never uncomfortable. Examples of these stimuli have included the character of the intersection between humanism and critical theory noted above and whether in our writing to refer to the teacher education programs at our institution about which we have researched as *further education and training* (the term used at that institution) or as *vocational education and training* (the term used in the broader Australian academic community). At the same time, we contend that productive synergies can and do help to produce enduring resonances that ensure that these stimuli strengthen rather than undermine the relationships that lie at the heart of our collaboration. We assert also that the elaboration of the triologue that has facilitated revisions to and/or confirmations of our respective and shared thinking, and the associated values, concepts and strategies outlined here, are vital ingredients of that production and strengthening.

Conclusion

This chapter has used our initially separate and then joint reflections on our first authorial collaboration to explore specific values, concepts and strategies that we have found effective in working and writing together. The notion of the triologue has been helpful in making those elements of our relationship explicit and constitutes one among several possible methods of using collaboration to write and of using writing to strengthen and extend that collaboration.

It is no coincidence that we have foregrounded our relationship in this discussion, because we regard our resilient interpersonal relations as the foundation for sustaining the synergies of our continued authorial collaboration. In particular, we argue that our professional and personal relationships with one another and with other members of the research team to which we belong compose a very resilient framework for that collaboration. As we have explored in the chapter, that framework has enabled us to share our prior knowledge and to explicate sites of both convergences and divergences in our respective conceptual, methodological and empirical interests and priorities.

As with the other chapters in the book, we realise that we have presented what appears to be a success story in which “we all lived happily ever after.” Certainly we acknowledge that collaborative writing is not easy and requires continued attentiveness to the multiple and sometimes conflicting voices of fellow research participants, other co-authors and ourselves. Equally, while we were fortunate in beginning our collaboration with an instinctive rapport, undoubtedly that rapport has changed and grown as our relationship has developed and also as external contexts have altered. Nevertheless we remain convinced of the sustaining synergies of our authorial collaboration about a particular set of issues in education research.

Acknowledgements

Dr Warren Midgley has provided valuable feedback as editor of this chapter, which also benefited from the insights of an anonymous peer reviewer.

References

- Arden, C. H. (2006). *The researcher I am is the person I am*. Unpublished essay, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Australia.
- Arden, C. H., Danaher, P. A., & Tyler, M. A. (2005, September). Struggling for purchase? What shape does a vocational education and training agenda take within a contemporary university education faculty? *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning, 1*(1), 32-47.
- Bagnall, R. G. (2000). Lifelong learning and the limitations of economic determinism. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 19*(1), 20-35.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics* (C. Emerson, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). Response to a question from the *Novyi Mir* editorial staff. In C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Eds.), “*Speech genres*” and other late essays (V. W. McGee, Trans.) (pp. 1-9). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Boshier, R. (2009). Mapping the new world. Retrieved from <http://www.edst.educ.ubc.ca>
- Brookfield, S. (1994). Tales from the dark side: A phenomenography of adult critical reflection. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 13*(3), 203-216.
- Cronin, B. (2004). Bowling alone together: Academic writing as distributed cognition. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 55*(6), 557-560.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- De Weerd, S. (1999). Dialoging: Exploring the dialectics. *Emergence 1*(3), 64-70.
- Driscoll, L. G., Parkes, K. A., Tilley-Lubbs, G. A., Brill, J. M., & Pitts Bannister, V. R. (2009). Navigating the lonely sea: Peer mentoring and collaboration among aspiring women scholars. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 17*(1), 5-21.

- Edwards, R., Ranson, S., & Strain, M. (2002). Reflexivity. Towards a theory of lifelong learning. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 21(6), 525-536.
- Erkens, G., Jaspers, J., Prangmsma, M., & Kanselaar, G. (2005). Coordination processes in computer supported collaborative writing. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 21(3), 463-486.
- Forman, J., & Markus, M. L. (2005). Research on collaboration, business communication, and technology. *Journal of Business Communication*, 42(1), 78-102.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books.
- Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Habermas, J. (1972). *Knowledge and human interests*. London, UK: Heinemann.
- Habermas, J. (1974). *Theory and practice*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Hainsworth, J. (2006). *Enabling truly collaborative writing on a computer*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Princeton University, Princeton, NJ.
- Hughes, C., & Agran, M. (1998). Introduction to the special issue on self-determination: Signaling systems change. *Journal of the Association of Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 23(1), 1-4.
- Kochan, F. K., & Mullen, C. A. (2001). Collaborative authorship: Reflections on a briar patch of twisted brambles. *Teachers College Record*. Retrieved from <http://www.tcrecord.org>
- Laterza, V., Carmichael, P., & Procter, R. (2007). The doubtful guest? A Virtual Research Environment for education. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 16(3), 249-267.
- Lingard, L., Schryer, C. F., Spafford, M. M., & Campbell, S. L. (2007). Negotiating the politics of identity in an interdisciplinary research team. *Qualitative Research*, 7(4), 501-519.
- Lowry, P. B., Curtis, A., & Lowry, M. R. (2004). Building a taxonomy and nomenclature of collaborative writing to improve interdisciplinary research and practice. *Journal of Business Communication*, 41(1), 66-99.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions in adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Noël, S., & Robert, J.-M. (2004). Empirical study on collaborative writing: What do co-authors do, use, and like? *Computer Supported Cooperative Work*, 13, 63-89.
- Novak, J. D., & Gowin, D. B. (1984). *Learning how to learn*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxman-Michelli, W. (1992). Critical thinking as “critical spirit”. *Institute for Critical Thinking Resource Publication, Series*, 4(7), 1-13.
- Palmer, P. J. (1998). *The courage to teach*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Parker, J. R., & Arden, C. H. (2006, November 3). *Doctoral research (re)design: Mapping the terrain*. Paper presented at the 1st annual University of Southern Queensland Faculty of Education Postgraduate and Early Career Researcher Group research symposium, , University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Australia.
- Ritchie, S. M., & Rigano, D. L. (2007). Writing together metaphorically and bodily side-by-side: An inquiry into collaborative academic writing. *Reflective Practice*, 8(1), 123-135.
- Siegel, H. (1988). *Education reason: Rationality, critical thinking, and education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*(3), 153-173.
- Tyler, M. A. (2006). Criticality: Its reflective utility within a Technical and Further Education workplace context. *Studies in Learning, Evaluation, Innovation and Development, 3*(2), 48-56.
- Tyler, M. A. (2008). Mapping the inner landscape of Australian TAFE teachers' work: Navigating contours by explicating critical spirit. In R. Henderson & P. A. Danaher (Eds.), *Troubling terrains: Tactics for traversing and transforming contemporary educational research* (pp. 119-136). Teneriffe, Australia: Post Pressed.
- Tyler, M. A. (2009a). *Torquing up TAFE teacher traction through a critical spirit discourse*. Paper presented at the 12th annual conference of the Australian Vocational Education and Training Research Association, Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.avetra.org.au>
- Tyler, M. A. (2009b). *Critical spirit manifestations in TAFE teachers and their work*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Australia.
- Tynan, B. R., & Garbett, D. L. (2007). Negotiating the university research culture: Collaborative voices of new academics. *Higher Education Research & Development, 26*(4), 411-424.
- Usher, R. (1987). The place of theory in designing curricula for the continuing education of adult educators. *Studies in the Education of Adults, 19*(1), 26-36.
- Weng, C., & Gennari, J. J. (2004). Asynchronous collaborative writing through annotations. In *Proceedings of the 2004 ACM conference on computer supported cooperative work* (pp. 578-581). New York, NY: Association for Computing Machinery.
- Weng, C., McDonald, D., Sparks, D., McCoy, J., & Gennari, J. (2007). Participatory design of a collaborative clinical trial protocol writing system. *International Journal of Medical Informatics, 76*, S235-S251.
- Wolfensberger, W. (1972). *Normalization: The principle of normalization in human services*. Toronto, Canada: National Institute on Mental Retardation.

Strategies for sustaining synergies

- Compare this chapter with the journal article that it discusses, and consider whether and if so in what ways the authors' writing collaboration has developed in the interim between the two texts.
- Brainstorm the possible methods of writing a co-authored paper and list the pros and cons of each method.
- Analyse whether some methods of co-authorship are linked with the developmental stages of research teams and/or whether each method can be appropriate depending on context and purpose.
- Identify the similarities and differences between the dialogue presented in this chapter and the research team's modus operandi.
- Topic for debate: "The current academic environment praises collaborative authorship rhetorically but rewards sole authorship in practice."

Further reading

- Cho, K., & Schunn, C. D. (2007, April). Scaffolded writing and rewriting in the discipline: A web-based reciprocal peer review system. *Computers & Education, 48*(3), 409-426.
- MacArthur, C. A., Graham, S., & Fitzgerald, J. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of writing research*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Marková, I., & Plichtová, J. (2007, June). East-West European Project: Transforming and shaping research through collaboration. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science, 41*(2), 124-138.
- Roig, M. (2006, August). *Avoiding plagiarism, self-plagiarism, and other questionable writing practices: A guide to ethical writing*. Retrieved from <http://www.paperpub.com.cn>